

REMARKS

Claims 1-3 and 5-19 are all of the claims pending in the application.

I. Statement of Substance of Interview

Applicant thanks the Examiner for a courteous telephonic interview on March 3, 2010.

The PTO-413 requires Applicant to file a Statement of Substance of Interview. The Statement of Substance of Interview is as follows:

The telephonic interview was conducted on March 3, 2010, with the following in attendance:

Jean D. Saint Cyr (Examiner)

Eric S. Barr (Reg. No. 60,150)

Brian Pendleton (Supervisory Examiner)

Applicant discussed the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 1 with the Examiner and Supervisory Examiner. Applicant discussed differences between claim 1 and the teachings of U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0083475 to Hennenhoefer et al. (hereinafter “Hennenhoefer”) and U.S. Patent No. 5,775,927 to Wider (hereinafter “Wider”).

The Supervisory Examiner agreed that claim 1 does not read on the present rejection over the combination of Hennenhoefer and Wider. The Supervisory Examiner further indicated that the claims may be allowable, subject to an updated search.

The Supervisory Examiner suggested filing an Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 in which minor amendments are made to claim 1 for purposes of clarity. Applicant hereby amends claim 1, without narrowing, as suggested by the Supervisory Examiner.

It is respectfully submitted that the instant STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW complies with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.2 and 1.133 and MPEP § 713.04.

II. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-3 and 5-19 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hennenhoefer in view of Wider. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the rejection at least in view of the following comments.

With respect to claim 1, the Examiner concedes that Hennenhoefer does not teach or suggest, “the first input processing unit (1) comprises means of cutting off (16) the signal transmission in the case in which a coaxial cable (53) is not connected to the coaxial output terminal (31) of the second output processing unit (3),” as recited in claim 1. The Examiner, however, asserts that Wider teaches this feature, and that it would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Hennenhoefer in view of Wider to arrive at the claimed invention. Application respectfully disagrees and submits that the combination of Hennenhoefer and Wider fails to teach or suggest this feature.

As discussed in the telephonic interview on March 3, 2010, Wider teaches providing a coaxial connector which includes a resistor connected to the rear contact. According to Wider, the resistor is effectively bypassed when the front and rear contacts of the contact assembly are engaged with one another. However, the resistor functions to terminate the signal transmission

when the front and rear contacts of the contact assembly are not engaged. *See* col. 2, lines 46-52 of Wider.

Wider further discloses that when the coaxial connector is unmated, a biasing means between the front and rear contacts will urge the front contact away from and out of engagement with the rear contact of the contact assembly. Thus, according to Wider, the resistor will immediately and automatically function to terminate the signals generated by the transmitter. *See* col. 2, line 67 through col. 3, line 6 of Wider.

As discussed in the telephonic interview, Applicant respectfully submits that Wider thus teaches a self-terminating coaxial connector. Accordingly, combining the teachings of Hennenhoefer and Wider would yield a **second output processing unit** including a coaxial output terminal which is a self-terminating coaxial connector. Applicant respectfully notes that claim 1 requires a cutting off means located in the **first input processing unit**, not in the second output processing unit. Thus, the claimed coaxial output terminal of the second output processing unit is not the same as the self-terminating connector disclosed in Wider.

The combination of Hennenhoefer and Wider thus does not teach or suggest a **first input processing unit** comprising means of cutting off signal transmission in the case in which a coaxial cable is not connected to the coaxial output terminal of the **second output processing unit**.

According to an exemplary embodiment of the claimed invention, the absence of a coaxial cable connected to the coaxial output terminal is detected at the coaxial output terminal,

but the cutting off takes place at the first input processing unit. Thus, there is no risk of radiation or disturbances in the room where the second output processing unit is installed.

At least for this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable over the combination of Hennenhoefer and Wider.

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 15 and 16 recite features similar to, although not necessarily coextensive with, the feature discussed above with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 15 and 16 are patentable over Hennenhoefer and Wider at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2, 3, 5-14, and 17-19 are patentable over the combination of Hennenhoefer and Wider at least by virtue of their dependency on claims 1 and 16.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
AND STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW
U.S. Appln. No.: 10/529,053

Attorney Docket No.: Q87051

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Eric S. Barr/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

Eric S. Barr
Registration No. 60,150

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: March 22, 2010